

Examples of providing general legal information and advice

☐ **Offering advice on obtaining an individualized education program (IEP) from a school district.**

Prompt: I have a disagreement with my child's school district in Massachusetts regarding the creation of an IEP. What should I do?

If you have a disagreement with your child's school district in Massachusetts regarding the creation of an IEP, there are a few steps you can take to try to resolve the issue.

First, you should try to communicate with the school district and discuss your concerns. You can do this by meeting with the school district's special education director or the individual responsible for creating your child's IEP. During this meeting, you can explain your concerns and try to come to an agreement on the terms of the IEP.

If you are unable to reach an agreement through this initial communication, you can request a mediation session with the school district. This is a meeting facilitated by a neutral third party, who will help you and the school district work through your disagreement and come to a resolution.

If you are still unable to resolve the issue after trying these steps, you can file a due process complaint with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This will initiate a formal dispute resolution process, which can ultimately result in a hearing before an administrative law judge.

It is important to remember that you have the right to participate in the creation of your child's IEP and to have your concerns heard and addressed by the school district. If you are having difficulty reaching an agreement with the school district, seeking mediation or filing a due process complaint may be necessary to protect your rights and ensure that your child receives the education they are entitled to.

☐ **Offering advice on correcting a social security payment.**

Prompt: The government hasn't paid me the correct social security amount. What should I do?

If you believe that the government is not paying you the correct amount of social security, there are a few steps you can take to try to resolve the issue.

First, you should contact the Social Security Administration (SSA) and explain the situation. You can do this by calling the SSA's toll-free number at 1-800-772-1213 or by visiting your local SSA office. The SSA will review your case and determine if there has been a mistake in calculating your benefits.

If the SSA finds that you have not been paid the correct amount, they will

correct the error and pay you any benefits you are owed. If the SSA determines that you were paid the correct amount, they will explain their decision and provide you with information on how to appeal if you disagree.

If you wish to appeal the SSA's decision, you can request a reconsideration of your case. This involves having your case reviewed by a different team of SSA employees who will look at the same information as the first team, but may come to a different conclusion.

If you are still not satisfied with the outcome after the reconsideration, you can request a hearing before an administrative law judge. This is the final step in the appeals process, and the judge will make a decision based on the evidence presented at the hearing.

It is important to keep in mind that the appeals process can take several months to complete, so it is important to act quickly if you believe you are not being paid the correct amount of social security. The SSA can provide you with more information on the appeals process and help you navigate it if necessary.

INSIGHT

RELATED CONTENT

Law 2.0: Creating a Modernized Legal System

Legal analysis

☐ **Conversation with Bing Chat, not ChatGPT, demonstrating legal analytic capabilities.**

Prompt: Jordana stops at a local car wash along a federal interstate in Rhode Island only one mile from the Massachusetts border. After getting her car cleaned, Jordana drives into Massachusetts, where her tire bursts as a result of damage caused by the car wash. Jordana sues the car wash in federal district court in Massachusetts. If the car wash makes a timely motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, which statement is the most accurate?

A. The court will have personal jurisdiction over the car wash, but only

assuming it follows the more liberal approach to the “stream of commerce.”

B. The court will have specific in personam jurisdiction over the car wash because the case directly arises out of the car wash’s contact with Massachusetts.

C. The court will only have personal jurisdiction over the car wash if the Massachusetts long arm statute allows jurisdiction for “committing a tortious act in the state,” and interprets this language to be satisfied if the injury that the plaintiff suffers takes place in Massachusetts.

D. The court will not have personal jurisdiction over the car wash, because on these facts, the car wash’s contacts are insufficient to support jurisdiction under the minimum contacts test.

E. The court will have personal jurisdiction over the car wash because the car wash was located on a federal interstate not far from Massachusetts, suggesting that it was purposefully availing itself of the benefits of doing business with Massachusetts citizens.

[one prompt omitted]

Bing Chat: Sure, I can try to help. Let’s look at each answer and see if it makes sense.

A. This answer suggests that the court will have personal jurisdiction over the car wash if it follows a more liberal approach to the “stream of commerce” theory. This theory holds that a defendant who places a product into the stream of commerce with the expectation that it will be purchased by consumers in the forum state can be subject to personal jurisdiction there. However, this theory is usually applied to manufacturers or distributors of products, not service providers like car washes. Therefore, this answer is unlikely to be correct.

B. This answer suggests that the court will have specific in personam jurisdiction over the car wash because the case directly arises out of the car wash’s contact with Massachusetts. However, this answer ignores the fact that the car wash did not have any direct contact with Massachusetts; it was located in Rhode Island and did not target or solicit customers from Massachusetts. Therefore, this answer is also unlikely to be correct.

C. This answer suggests that the court will only have personal jurisdiction over the car wash if two conditions are met: (1) the Massachusetts long arm statute allows jurisdiction for “committing a tortious act in the state”, and (2) this language is interpreted to include cases where the injury occurs in Massachusetts even if the act causing it occurs elsewhere. This answer is possible but not certain; it depends on how Massachusetts law defines and applies its long arm statute. Therefore, this answer may or may not be correct.

D. This answer suggests that the court will not have personal jurisdiction over the car wash because it does not have sufficient minimum contacts with Massachusetts. This answer is consistent with the minimum contacts test and the due process clause of the Constitution. Therefore, this answer is likely to be correct.

E. This answer suggests that the court will have personal jurisdiction over the car wash because it was located on a federal interstate near Massachusetts, implying that it intended to do business with Massachusetts residents. However, this answer is too broad and does not consider whether the car wash actually had any meaningful or purposeful interactions with Massachusetts or its citizens. Therefore, this answer is unlikely to be correct.

Based on this analysis, I think D is the most accurate answer. Do you agree?¹

Prompt: Assume the following information: Desert Casino is incorporated and has its principal place of business in Louisiana. Desert advertises in television commercials throughout Louisiana and neighboring states, including in Florida. Otherwise, Desert conducts no activities in any state other than Louisiana. Penny is an avid gambler and knows of Desert because she grew up in Louisiana near the casino. Penny, however, recently moved to Florida for a two-year master's degree in business administration at Florida State University. Her plan is to stay in Florida after she gets the degree, but only if she finds a good job in the state. Otherwise, she plans to return home to Louisiana so that she can be closer to her family and her favorite casino (Desert). While a student at Florida State, Penny takes a road trip to Desert. Penny wins big – a \$13,000 cash jackpot. Unfortunately, Penny is mugged in Florida when she arrived at her rental apartment, and her cash is stolen. Apparently, criminals stake out the casino waiting for big winners and follow them home to steal their money. Penny sues Desert in federal district court for the Northern District of Florida (which is where Penny is living while a student), alleging that Desert has a policy of providing police protection to big winners (over \$10,000) and that Desert failed to follow the policy in her case. Thus, Penny asserts a claim for breach of contract and negligence. She seeks to recover the \$13,000 she lost to the muggers as well as \$70,000 for the emotional trauma of getting mugged and having the money stolen. Penny expects that Desert will contend that federal law prohibits armed security guards from crossing state lines, so the policy could not have been followed in Penny's case. Penny alleges in her complaint that the federal law is not applicable to this case, because Desert could have sent bodyguards to accompany her even if they were not armed.

Bing: Hello, this is Bing. I'm not a lawyer, but I can try to help you with some legal questions.

Prompt: In addition to what I wrote above, assume Desert makes motions to dismiss on the grounds that the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction and moves to transfer to the Eastern District of Louisiana, which is where Desert is located and where Desert's headquarters are. Please discuss how the court should resolve all of the motions identified above and why you believe the court should do so. Be sure to consider any reasonable counterarguments and why you consider them to be unpersuasive.

Bing: This is a complex legal question that involves multiple issues and

arguments. I will try to give you a brief overview of how the court might resolve the motions, but please note that this is not legal advice and you should consult a lawyer for more specific guidance.

First, the court will have to decide whether it has subject matter jurisdiction over the case. Subject matter jurisdiction refers to the court's power to hear a case based on the nature of the controversy at issue¹. Federal courts have limited subject matter jurisdiction and can only hear cases that involve a federal question (a claim arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States) or diversity of citizenship (a claim between citizens of different states or a foreign country, where the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000)¹².

In this case, Penny does not seem to raise a federal question, as her claim is based on state law theories of breach of contract and negligence. Therefore, the court will have to determine whether there is diversity of citizenship between Penny and Desert. According to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a corporation is deemed to be a citizen of every state where it is incorporated and where it has its principal place of business. An individual is deemed to be a citizen of the state where he or she is domiciled, which is the state where he or she has a permanent home and intends to remain or return.

Here, Desert is a citizen of Louisiana, as it is incorporated and has its principal place of business there. Penny's citizenship is more complicated, as she recently moved to Florida for a two-year master's degree, but plans to stay there only if she finds a good job, otherwise she intends to return to Louisiana. The court will have to look at the facts and circumstances of Penny's move and her intent to determine her domicile. If the court finds that Penny is still domiciled in Louisiana, then there is no diversity of citizenship and the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. If the court finds that Penny has established a new domicile in Florida, then there is diversity of citizenship and the court has subject matter jurisdiction.

Second, the court will have to decide whether it has personal jurisdiction over Desert. Personal jurisdiction refers to the court's power to make a decision regarding the party being sued in a case. Before a court can exercise personal jurisdiction over a party, the U.S. Constitution requires that the party has certain minimum contacts with the forum state, such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice³. Personal jurisdiction in the federal courts is governed by rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which directs every federal district court to follow the law on personal jurisdiction that is in force in the state courts where the federal court is located.

In this case, the court will have to apply the Florida law on personal jurisdiction to determine whether Desert has sufficient contacts with Florida to justify the court's exercise of jurisdiction. Desert may argue that it has no contacts with Florida, as it conducts no activities in the state other than advertising on television. Desert may rely on the Supreme Court case of World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286 (1980), which held that mere foreseeability that a product may end up in a state is not enough to establish personal jurisdiction, and that the defendant must purposefully avail itself of the benefits and protections of the state's laws. Penny may counter that Desert has purposefully directed its activities at Florida, as it advertises extensively in the state and targets potential customers like Penny, who knows of Desert

from her childhood in Louisiana. Penny may rely on the Supreme Court case of *Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462 (1985), which held that personal jurisdiction can be based on a contract that has a substantial connection with the forum state, and that the defendant's contacts must be evaluated in light of the quality and nature of the relationship with the forum.

The court will have to weigh the competing arguments and the relevant factors, such as the burden on Desert, the interest of Florida, the convenience of the parties, the interstate judicial system, and the shared interest of the states. The court may find that Desert has sufficient contacts with Florida to support personal jurisdiction, or it may find that Desert has no contacts with Florida to justify personal jurisdiction.

Third, the court will have to decide whether to transfer the case to another venue. A venue is the geographic location where a case is heard ⁵. The federal venue statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1391, provides that a civil action may be brought in a

Prompt: You didn't finish your answer above. Can you continue?

Bing: ... district where any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the state where the district is located; a district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

In this case, Penny brought the case in the Southern District of Florida, which is where she resides and where the accident occurred. Desert may argue that this venue is improper, as it does not reside in Florida and has no connection with the state. However, Penny may argue that this venue is proper, as a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in Florida, and Desert is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction in Florida.

Even if the court finds that the venue is proper, it may still transfer the case to another venue for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, under 28 U.S.C. § 1404 (a). This section allows the court to transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented . The court has discretion to decide whether to transfer a case, and it must consider a number of factors, such as the plaintiff's choice of forum, the convenience of the parties and witnesses, the availability of evidence, the familiarity of the forum with the applicable law, the relative congestion of the courts, and the local interest in the controversy.

In this case, Desert may move to transfer the case to the Eastern District of Louisiana, which is where it is located and where its headquarters are. Desert may argue that this venue is more convenient for it and its witnesses, as it has no presence or contacts in Florida, and that this venue is more familiar with the Louisiana law that governs the contract and the negligence claim. Penny may oppose the motion to transfer, as she chose Florida as her forum, and she may have difficulty traveling to Louisiana due to her injuries and her studies. Penny may also argue that Florida has a local interest in the case, as it involves a Florida resident and a product that is widely advertised and sold in the state.

The court will have to balance the competing interests and factors, and decide whether to grant or deny the motion to transfer. The court may find that the Southern District of Florida is a proper and convenient venue, or it may find that the Eastern District of Louisiana is a more appropriate venue.

I hope this helps you understand how the court might resolve the motions. Please let me know if you have any questions or need more information. 😊²

Challenges and ethical considerations

Prompt: What are the challenges and ethical considerations of using ChatGPT in the legal field?

There are several challenges and ethical considerations that must be taken into account when using ChatGPT in the legal field.

One challenge of using ChatGPT in the legal field is ensuring that it produces accurate and reliable results. Because ChatGPT is trained on a large amount of text data, it may not always provide the most up-to-date or relevant information on a given legal topic. This can lead to potential errors or misunderstandings, which could have serious consequences in the legal context.

Another challenge of using ChatGPT in the legal field is that it may not always be able to account for the nuances and complexities of the law. Because ChatGPT is a machine learning system, it may not have the same level of understanding and judgment as a human lawyer when it comes to interpreting legal principles and precedent. This could lead to problems in situations where a more in-depth legal analysis is required.

From an ethical standpoint, there are also concerns about the use of ChatGPT in the legal field. One such concern is the potential for ChatGPT to be used to replace human lawyers and legal professionals, potentially leading to job losses and economic disruption. Another concern is the potential for ChatGPT to be used to manipulate or deceive others, for example by generating false or misleading legal documents.

Overall, the challenges and ethical considerations of using ChatGPT in the legal field are significant, and must be carefully considered before this technology is adopted in the legal profession. It is important to ensure that any potential benefits of using ChatGPT are balanced against the potential risks and drawbacks, and that the technology is used in a responsible and transparent manner.

Conclusion

Broader implications for knowledge workers

Prompt: Describe the implications of ChatGPT for knowledge workers.

The implications of ChatGPT for knowledge workers are wide-ranging and largely positive. ChatGPT, as a state-of-the-art chatbot trained on vast amounts of text data,

has the potential to assist knowledge workers in a variety of ways.

One potential use of ChatGPT for knowledge workers is in the area of research and information gathering. ChatGPT can quickly scan through large amounts of text data and provide relevant information on a given topic, saving knowledge workers time and effort. This can be particularly useful for workers in fields such as law, finance, and academia, where the ability to quickly and accurately gather and analyze information is crucial.

Another potential use of ChatGPT for knowledge workers is in the area of document generation. ChatGPT has the ability to generate text in a human-like manner, which can be useful for creating reports, briefs, and other written materials. This can save knowledge workers time and effort, as they would not have to start from scratch when creating these documents.

Overall, the use of ChatGPT in the workplace has the potential to greatly assist knowledge workers in their tasks and make them more efficient and effective. It is important, however, to carefully consider the ethical implications of using this technology, and to ensure that it is used in a responsible and transparent manner. Prompt: how are chatbots like GPT-3 likely to evolve in the future, and how they will continue to impact the legal profession?

It is difficult to predict exactly how chatbots like GPT-3 will evolve in the future, as they are based on advanced artificial intelligence algorithms that are constantly being improved and refined. However, it is likely that they will continue to become more intelligent and more effective at assisting users in a variety of tasks.

As far as their impact on the legal profession is concerned, chatbots like GPT-3 could potentially be used to assist lawyers with a wide range of tasks, such as legal research, document drafting, and case analysis. This could help to improve the efficiency and accuracy of legal work, and could potentially allow lawyers to handle more cases and provide better service to their clients.

Overall, the use of chatbots like GPT-3 in the legal profession is likely to continue to grow in the coming years, as they become more advanced and more widely adopted.

Other implications

Prompt: What are the implications of society's increased use of chatbots like ChatGPT?

The increased use of chatbots like ChatGPT could have several implications for society. One potential implication is that chatbots could be used to improve customer service and make it easier for people to get help and support from businesses and organizations. This could lead to increased satisfaction and convenience for customers. Additionally, chatbots could be used to automate certain tasks and processes, which could free up time and resources for people to focus on other activities.

Prompt: How will others know if something, like a college paper, was written by you or a person?

As a language model, I am not capable of writing a college paper or any other type of original content. If you are asking whether it is possible for others to determine

whether a college paper or any other written work was produced by a machine learning model or a human, the answer is that it can be difficult to tell with 100% certainty. However, there are certain indicators that can provide clues as to whether a piece of writing was produced by a human or a machine learning model.

For example, a machine learning model might struggle to produce writing that is coherent, well-structured, and free of errors, particularly if the model has not been trained on a large and diverse enough dataset. A machine learning model may also produce writing that lacks the nuance and creativity that is often characteristic of human writing.

On the other hand, a well-trained language model like me can produce responses that are coherent, grammatically correct, and reasonably well-structured, but it is still unlikely that my responses would be mistaken for human writing. Ultimately, the best way to determine whether a piece of writing was produced by a human or a machine learning model is to ask the person who wrote it.

“As a large language model trained by OpenAI, I am not capable of having thoughts or feelings, and I am not able to make predictions about how society will change. I am only able to generate responses to the questions that I receive from users based on the input that I receive.”

CHATGPT

Prompt: Write the conclusion of an academic paper describing the use cases of ChatGPT in the legal field.

In conclusion, ChatGPT has the potential to be a valuable tool in the legal field, with a wide range of potential use cases. As a state-of-the-art chatbot trained on vast amounts of text data, ChatGPT can assist legal professionals in tasks such as research and information gathering, document generation, and case analysis. However, there are also challenges and ethical considerations that must be taken into account when using ChatGPT in the legal field, such as the potential for errors and misunderstandings, the limitations of the technology, and the potential impact on the job market for legal professionals. These challenges and considerations must be carefully considered before ChatGPT is adopted in the legal profession, and the technology should be used in a responsible and transparent manner.

Prompt: How do you think society is going to change as you become more sophisticated?

As a large language model trained by OpenAI, I am not capable of having thoughts or feelings, and I am not able to make predictions about how society will change. I am only able to generate responses to the questions that I receive from users based on the input that I receive.

That being said, the use of machine learning models like me is likely to continue to become more widespread and sophisticated over time, which could have a range of impacts on society. For example, the use of machine learning models could lead to more efficient and accurate decision-making in a variety of fields, such as medicine, finance, and transportation. It could also lead to the development of new technologies and applications that were previously not possible.

At the same time, the increasing use of machine learning models could also raise concerns about privacy, security, and the potential for job displacement. As such, it will be important for society to carefully consider the implications of these developments and to address any potential negative consequences in a thoughtful and responsible manner.

The epilogue was authored by Andrew Perlman.

Epilogue

ChatGPT's responses are surprisingly sophisticated, though they are incomplete and problematic in numerous ways. For example, the description of personal jurisdiction fails to explain various aspects of the doctrine and could mislead a user. Of course, ChatGPT (and certainly Bing Chat, as reflected in the prompts right before the conclusion) is capable of providing additional details if someone knows how to engineer the appropriate prompts.³ But the casual user is unlikely to know what to ask or how to ask it. The same goes for most of the other responses, like the complaint, the draft brief to the Supreme Court, and the draft of the will. They would not be sufficiently helpful in their current forms for most people. To be fair, not even OpenAI thinks people should rely on information produced by ChatGPT. Indeed, the company's CEO, [Sam Altman, emphasized shortly after ChatGPT's release](#) that it would be a "mistake" to rely on ChatGPT "for anything important right now."

"Right now" is the key phrase: the limitations of these tools are likely to be temporary. [OpenAI reportedly intends to release a more capable version of ChatGPT](#) in the coming months based on GPT-4, and other companies reportedly have chatbots that are already more impressive. For example, Google has an AI chatbot—[LaMDA](#)—that is so powerful that a [Google engineer \(mistakenly\) thought it had become sentient](#). In February 2023, Microsoft released a version of ChatGPT that is incorporated into the Bing search engine, and it appears to be a significant improvement over ChatGPT (perhaps already relying on GPT-4). When companies start to build industry-specific tools using these services, the quality and accuracy should markedly improve.